Klansmen in Alabama's Police, P. 3

New Frontier's First New Idea—For the Tractor Business, P. 2; Why We Behave So Oddly in Korea, P. 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IX, NO. 20 MAY 29, 1961 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

On A Certain Blindness to the Peril of Racism

Our hat is off to the Attorney General for acting with vigor and dispatch in Montgomery's outburst of white racist violence, and we hope the President will move into a position of active leadership if trouble spreads, as it is likely to do. For this is one of these strange situations in which law and order are no longer synonyms but suddenly almost opposites. If the young students now making history in the South persist in insisting that the government uphold the law's guarantee of equal treatment for white and black, there will be *dis*order. If they and the Negro community are persuaded to sink back into acquiescence, there will again be order.

The South Mistakes Jesus for Marx

But the South has too long been enabled to enjoy order at the expense of law, to persist in those peculiar customs which once meant slavery and now mean humiliation for the darker half of its citizens. The "Freedom Riders" have achieved the first great success of Gandhi's non-violent tactics in America by striking at those crucial points in the system of white supremacy where direct action is possible. The South can drag its heels for years on school segregation, as it has for decades on voter rights, but the right to sit unsegregated in a bus or at a lunch counter is a right an individual can enforce for himself if he has the courage to face up to insult and injury, to persist, and to establish his moral superiority by turning the other cheek. It is not surprising that this sudden appearance of literal fidelity to the Gospel should so startle the supposedly pious South that the tactic is blamed on Marx rather than Jesus. The "Freedom Riders" have again made Christianity a revolutionary creed.

Mr. Kennedy has said in another connection that things will probably get worse before they get better. This is true in the South. A moment is rapidly approaching, perhaps in Mississippi, when Mr. Kennedy will have to do what he criticized Mr. Eisenhower for not doing—and that is to bring the full moral force of his high office to bear. The fact that only one Southern Senator, Ervin of North Carolina, has spoken up in support of the Federal government's action in Montgomery, that the whole Alabama delegation has asked for the withdrawal of the Federal marshals, that the Governors of Mississippi and Arkansas have spoken up in support of the Governor of Alabama, that they all blame the "agitators", indicates the dimensions of the challenge. The Southern mobster, like the Communist guerrilla in another context, is effective because he has tacit, popular sympathy; the Southern white may deplore violence, but he'd like to see the Negro kept down in an inferiority which is profitable and flattering to him.

Too many Southern men and women regard freedom to humiliate Negroes as their most precious constitutional right. The struggle for equality is in this sense as irreconcilable as was the struggle against slavery.

In this struggle public attention should be focussed on the extent to which a curious lack of antipathy for extreme racist organizations like the Klan affects the forces, so-called, of law and order. On page three we print excerpts from a published report by Alabama citizens on the extent to which the police are actually infiltrated by the Klan. We also call attention to the recently released House Appropriations Committee hearings on the Justice Department budget. Here we find the head of the FBI treating the sit-ins (see box on this page) as a Communist plot in a way which can only encourage the racial paranoia endemic in the South. Though the Klan and allied organizations have been growing rapidly, Mr. Hoover still clings to the senescent and dwindling Communist Party, USA, as our No. 1 subversive menace. He claims to have "some 200 known or suspected, Communist front and Communist-infiltrated organizations" under investigation by the FBI, a number so inflated to anyone aware of the realities on the shrunken American Left that one assumes he must suspect Marxist-Leninists even in the patriotic bosom of the DAR. But there is not a word about keeping our rapidly expanding network of racist and Fascist groups under surveillance. Mr. Hoover is fierce about Reds, pinks and—a favorite target of his scorn—"do-gooders", but he never seems to warn against racism, just as Senator Eastland never subpoenas Klansmen as a menace to internal security nor Mr. Walter preachers of race hatred as un-American.

J. Edgar Sees the Sit-Ins as a Red Plot

"Communist propaganda has always been quick to seize on problems of minority groups. Instances involving the Negro race have been prime targets in this barrage. The sit-in demonstrations in the South were a made-to-order issue which the party fully exploited to further its own ends. . . . The Communist Party strategy was not to openly advocate picketing, inasmuch as this would tend to expose its members, but rather to get behind the movement by urging college students to take the initiative. The importance which the Communist Party, USA, has placed on these demonstrations were sharply brought into focus when Benjamin Davis, the party's national secretary [a Negro—IFS], told the Party in March, 1960, that these demonstrations were considered the next best thing to 'proletarian revolution'."

—FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover, testifying on the 1962 budget in the newly released House Appropriations Committee hearings, p. 423.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Wait For Fiascoes? Why Not Farm Equipment (As Well As Food) For Peace?

At Last the New Frontier Turns Up A New Idea — For the Tractor Trade

It is unkind to suggest, but we can't resist it, that the New Frontier has finally produced a new idea—a way to stimulate the tractor business. A few more unsuccessful invasions below the border, by exiles who talked of fighting to the death but (judging by the number of prisoners) quickly turned themselves in almost to a man, and there will be a boom in farm equipment.

Having unburdened ourselves of that nasty joke, we now want to praise the President for giving the green light, and publicly admitting it, for the prisoners-for-tractors deal. He sought to fulfill a moral obligation to the exiles at considerable political risk. One has only to compare his attitude with the appalling speech by Morse in the Senate Monday, with its implication that it would be better to leave the prisoners to be "liquidated" than take a step which Morse said might "embarrass—yes, jeopardize—the welfare of this country!"

Mrs. Roosevelt's Sure Touch

Mrs. Roosevelt, with her sure touch for the humane, stressed the fact that the tractors were not just ransom but a friendly gesture to the Cuban people. If we give food for peace, why not tractors for peace? Why not offer farm machinery on long term credits to all our Latin neighbors? Why wait for revolution and unsuccessful counter revolution? Why not act wisely in advance?

There is now a real danger that Congress instead of investigating the bad advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA will take out its frustration on the much safer task of assailing the tractor deal. In this, we salute Senator Gore for outspoken good sense after hearing General Lemnitzer, the Army Chief of Staff, in executive session of Morse's Latin American subcommittee. A Joint Chiefs of Staff which could not handle successfully as miniature an operation as the Cuban invasion certainly cannot be relied upon for more distant and difficult military adventures. Either they are incompetent—and there is plenty of evidence to suggest that none of them are geniuses—*or they allowed this adventure sloppily to go forward, knowing it would fail but hoping that it would serve to force the President's hand and push us into direct military intervention.* (This theory I have heard from Cuban exile sources.) In either case, Senator Gore is right and a shakeup is called for. The Cuban fiasco was a lightning flash illuminating for us the inner realties of our vast military and intelligence bureaucracies. This revelation ought not to be shoved under the rug.

We need to face up to the fact not only that counter revolution has failed but that Latin America will not support us in action against Cuba. To recognize realities, to resume relations, to buy Cuban sugar (and reimburse U.S. property owners from the premium above the world price) is the road of sanity and the one way to restore American influence in Cuba. Cuba ought to be the first assignment of the peace corps.

The One Vote Against War On Cuba

"I voted against the resolution because I favor one more effort to talk to Cuba. I am opposed to invasion of Cuba supported directly or surreptitiously by the United States. I am opposed to a blockade of Cuba, because that would lead to a major war as sure as night follows day. I voted against this resolution for two basic reasons:

"First, it is doubtful that the U.S. can get the necessary two-thirds of the members of the OAS to support sanctions, and if our attempt at sanctions were to fail, the U.S. would again be exposed to the world in a weak, confused position. Second, at best an effort at sanctions will split the Latin-American nations, causing them to choose up sides at a time when we need cohesion and unity in this hemisphere. Furthermore, if sanctions are imposed, Castro would only become a hero and stronger in Cuba than he is now.

"Sanctions against Cuba through curtailment of American exports have already cost the U.S. a loss of $545 million. The Iron Curtain countries are now taking over our exports to Cuba, including such items as automobiles. I hope we don't 'sanction' the U.S. out of the $3 billion trade we now enjoy in Latin America."

—Kowalski (D. Conn.) explaining his vote May 17 against a resolution for sanctions through the OAS against Cuba. It was approved 402 to 2 with little discussion by a herd-like House. The other 'nay' vote was cast by far-rightist Clare Hoffman (R. Mich.) who prefers direct action against Cuba instead.

Five Democratic Congressmen Question Offer of Polaris Subs to NATO

"It is with great concern that we view the reported offer of the U.S. to commit Polaris nuclear submarines to forces assigned to NATO. In 1954 Congress enacted the Atomic Energy Act which provides that nuclear weapons may be used only at the direction of the President. This law reflects the deep concern of the Congress that, if nuclear weapons were under the control of other nations, the possibility of all out war would be increased immensely.

"The recent offer of Polaris submarines raises questions which are of vital importance to the Nation and the people we represent as Members of Congress.

"1. Under the present offer, who will have ultimate command over these submarines?

"2. If there is aggression in Europe, who will have the authority to issue an order to use the Polaris nuclear weapons? (a) To what extent will the NATO commander participate in this decision? (b) Will the other NATO nations have the power to veto a U.S. decision to use these Polaris submarines? (c) Will the U.S. Government have the right to veto a NATO decision to use these Polaris submarines?

"3. Does this offer of nuclear submarines indicate that the Administration has decided to arm NATO with any other nuclear weapon?

"4. How does the U.S. plan to integrate these submarines into the NATO striking force?

"We would very much appreciate an answer to these questions and respectfully request that no final decision should be made on this issue until Congress has the opportunity to consider this matter fully."

—Open Letter to the Secretary of State May 18 by five Democratic Congressmen: Ashley, Ohio; Blatnik, Minn.; Kastenmeier, Wis.; Kowalski, Conn. and Wm. Fitts Ryan, N.Y. The letter was ignored by the press.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Hate to See Democracy Go, But Feel More Secure With A Rightist Dictatorship

Why the Tail Is Allowed to Wag the Dog in Our Satellite Korea

Korea, like Iran, is another of those convulsions in our far-flung but crumbling American empire. As usual, despite our open society and free press, we don't really know what happened there. But if we stand back from the picture, we can see the main outlines. The logic of the situation in Korea indicated that there would soon be a swing to the left or to the right; certain army leaders, facing cuts in their own power and payrolls, acted first. Our government met the crisis with a divided mind. We didn't like to see democracy go but at the same time we felt that maybe a comfortably anti-Communist military dictatorship would be a better safeguard for our essential interests. Our press as a whole, sharing this characteristic national mood, reveals a bit of the truth, enables us to glimpse the Fascist-style terror in the wake of the coup, but there is no outcry about loss of civil liberties and the sufferings of the South Koreans under the yoke of despotism. That rhetoric we reserve for Cuba. In brief, we dislike dictatorships imposed to bring about fundamental social reform. We "rapes easy" when a dictatorship comes along to prevent social reform. This is the pattern of our policy in Asia, as in Latin America.

Korean "Democrats" As Bad As "Liberals"

As often happens, one can get a clearer picture from the press abroad than at home. We recommend a full page article in *Le Figaro* April 6. It provides a vivid picture of events since the Rhee dictatorship was overthrown in April 1960: the disappointment of the students with the Chang regime and the extent to which its leading "Democrats" were financed by the same corrupt "Liberals" who supported Rhee; bad crop conditions (as in neighboring China) had put the poor farmers in hock to the userers, a common feature of the Oriental countryside, and there were reports of peasant risings. There was enough democratic liberty under the new regime to give discontent a voice but not enough vision in a stodgily conservative government to satisfy popular aspiration. Korean feeling, strikingly without anti-Americanism in the overthrow of Rhee, began to change. "For the first time since the bitter Korean civil war," a correspondent reported from Seoul in *Eastern World* (London) May 1961, "signs blackly demanding 'Yankee, Go Home'," began to appear in the popular demonstrations against the Chang government. We read there of a National Union of US Armed Forces Employes clashing with the police before the very doors of the U.S. Embassy. U.S. Army authorities were reported fearful of this anti-Americanism and distrustful of demands in the Assembly for a "status of forces" agreements which would have subjected our GI's to the Korean courts. Koreans resented our efforts to tighten up on corrupt uses of our aid funds and to enforce fiscal stabilization. Above all, we feared renewed demands to loosen up the tight wall between the industrial north and the agricultural South of that unhappily divided land, with a border which makes that between East and West Germany seem easy and open.

So at the cost of appearing ludicrous and undermining respect for our military command, we have acquiesced in the seizure of power by a small handful of military mutineers led by a "reformed" ex-Communist. We pay the Army; the country is a ward of the United Nations; its army—fantastically the fourth largest in the world—would dissolve overnight without the quarter billion dollars a year we pour into the country. Yet somehow the tail wags the dog. It wags the dog because instinctively that is how the dog would like to be wagged. This is the secret of this tragicomic story.

Forbidden Thoughts Dept.

Judging by an extension of remarks in the Congressional Record May 22, Chairman Walter of the Un-American Activities Committee has been upset by unfavorable reactions from college campuses on his plans to investigate the Fund for Social Analysis. Hearings were to have begun last Monday but Mr. Walter said they had been postponed until a later date. New subpoenas call for a hearing on May 31. The Fund aids research on problems of Marxist theory and its application to social analysis. Grants have been made by it to Professors Paul A. Baran, Gordon K. Lewis and William Appleman Williams; Drs. Herbert Aptheker and Bernice Shoul and graduate student Martin J. Sklar. In the Committee's eyes, of course, Marxist studies represent forbidden thoughts.

Alabama Police and Even Bench Infiltrated by Klan and Other Rightist Groups

". . . the majority of the respondents felt that the police did not enjoy the confidence of the Negro citizens to such an extent that the citizens would feel free to summon them for protection in case of threat of crime or harm against them. . . . The highest recorded vote of non-confidence was for the local officials of Montgomery and the next highest was for those of Birmingham. . . . All except six of the Negro respondents felt that citizens preferred private settlement of their grievances rather than calling the police. In Montgomery and in Birmingham the sentiment in regard to this was unanimous . . . the police use of mounted posses and of vicious dogs as guards were regarded as a greater threat to Negro citizens than anything the police could guard them against. . . .

"Another item that seemed to be symptomatic of the unfavorable attitude of local officials towards the police was the response by the observers [an anonymous questionnaire had been sent in March and April of this year to '120 well informed observers' white and Negro—IFS] to the question about collusion between the police and the Ku Klux Klan. About 65% of the respondents intimated that local officials give the appearance of working hand in hand with right-wing terrorist groups such as the Ku Klux Klan . . . about 45 percent of the respondents indicated that local officials were known to hold memberships in the Ku Klux Klan or in these right-wing subversive, terrorist organizations. . . .

"A surprising number (18) of the [46] respondents stated that instances had been reported where judges seemed to be influenced by right-wing, terroristic and subversive organizations like the KKK. Nine of the respondents, however, noted the history-making cases of verdicts against Klansmen by Birmingham and Montgomery judges in cases involving crimes by Klansmen against Negroes."

—Report by Alabama Advisory Committee of Civil Rights Commission, first brought to light by Fletcher Knebel, in the Cowles Newspapers, May 22-23.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The SEP's "Report the President Wanted Published" Fosters Military Delusions

The Real Story Behind That One Viet Village Which Defies Guerrillas

The *Saturday Evening Post* last week (May 20) printed a story called "The Report the President Wanted Published." It carried an editor's note saying that their story was based on a report from an Air Force officer in Vietnam which attracted President Kennedy's attention. The report told of a visit to a region of South Vietnam which "has for years been controlled by Communist guerrillas." It dealt with one village, Binh Hing, which had nevertheless held out against the Communists.

The report originally was classified. "But behind the official language of the report," the editors of the SEP said, "the President saw a story of human valor and dedication to freedom, a reminder that Communism is not the wave of the future. It was a story, he felt, that many people ought to read, and he wrote a memorandum suggesting that the report would make 'an excellent article for a magazine like the *Saturday Evening Post*."

He Knows All About Them From TV

"Chairman Richard B. Russell (D. Ga.) of the Senate Armed Services Committee wants the Army to find another name for its Special Forces—something like Rangers or Scouts. The Senator told Army Secretary Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., not to let the word 'guerrilla' get mixed up in the name.

"'I rather associate guerrillas and bushwackers to be on the side of the bad folks on television,' Senator Russell said, 'and the Rangers and the Boy Scouts on the side of purity and justice'."

—Army Navy Air Force Journal May 20.

This SEP article, in our opinion, merely fosters the inflated hopes aroused by the Army's publicity campaign about counter guerrilla tactics. This one village is about as atypical as any to be found in Buddhist and Taoist South Vietnam. It was established by Catholic Chinese refugees led by a Roman Catholic priest who had been a lieutenant colonel in Chiang Kai-shek's army. Such men have something to fight for—their very existence.

It is equally obvious that the native Laotian villagers in the same general area did not fight, or the region would not have been "for years controlled by Communist guerrillas." The really sobering question is why the native Laotians in that region either supported the guerrillas or did not feel hostile enough to put up a fight against them.

We Thought Congress Was Supposed to Give That Word

"The Special Warfare Center . . . also appears to have an open line to the desk of a top presidential assistant at the White House. . . . Because this road is new and uncharted, it is dangerous. What, for instance, happens to a trooper if he is captured—as some may be—within a country against which we have never declared war? . . . Special troopers like their new role. . . . Now they consider themselves, 'The President's Own,' the same way British regiments used to pledge personal fidelity to their sovereign. 'When he needs us, we'll be ready,' a battle-scarred major said the other evening. 'All he needs do is give the word,' chimed in a young lieutenant."

—Washington Daily News May 15, series from Fort Bragg, N.C. on our "unconventional warfare" forces.

Handfuls of guerrillas can dominate a whole countryside only when the government is weak, corrupt and unpopular. *Newsweek's* cover story on Southeast Asia (May 22) provides some clues when it tells of the brutality with which Diem's so-called reforms in South Vietnam have been carried out, like his effort, now suspended, to force the peasantry into Communist style "agrovilles" which combined the features of a commune and a concentration camp.

One Vietnamese officer engaged in anti-guerrilla work was quoted in *Newsweek* as saying, "It's obvious that the population knows what's going on, but they refuse to talk. So they have to be roughed up—or worse. After an operation of this sort, those who aren't Viet Cong [pro Communist guerrilla] already probably will be. It's a vicious circle." The fact that a village of Roman Catholic Chinese Nationalists holds out is a tribute to their courage, but has no real bearing on the problem in South Vietnam.

Help Us By Selling A Sub to A Friend by Phone or Over Luncheon

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

5/29/61

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED